REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview. During the interview, the Examiner suggested amendments to the claims to help overcome the cited references. The Examiner indicated that amendments directed towards the subject matter of the amendments currently made should overcome the cited references.

Claims 1, 11 and 20 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-27 were previously canceled; claims 1, 11, 20 were amended; and no claims were added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anand* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0032590 A1) (hereafter "*Anand*") in view of *Raventos* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194244 A1) (hereafter "*Raventos*") and further in view of *Fish et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,073 B1) (hereafter "*Fish*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The examiner states:

> As to claim 1, Anand teaches a method for managing the provisioning of a plurality of resources in a data processing system, said plurality of resources being a plurality of different types (see Abstract, Fig. 2 and 5), said method comprising the steps of:
>
> defining a plurality of provisioning states for each one of said plurality of different types of resources (page 1, [0008], page 2, [0012]-[0013], page 4, [0038], page 5, [0051]);
>
> defining relationships among said plurality of provisioning states, said relationships describing valid transitions from ones of said plurality of provisioning states to other ones of said plurality of provisioning states (page 4, [0040], [0045], page 5, [0059], page 2, [0012]); and
>
> defining at least one task that is associated with each one of said valid transitions, wherein defining at least one task that is associated with each one of said valid transitions, comprises (page 2, [0012]-[0013], page 4, [0040], [0045]):
>
> specifying a plurality of tasks for each one of said valid transitions (page 2, [0012]-[0013], page 4, [0040], [0045]);
>
> completing said one of said valid transitions for each one of said plurality of different types of resources (standalone computer, notebook computer, hand-held computer, PDA, etc), wherein the same module is used regardless of which resource type is being transitioned (page 3, [0031], [0037], page 5, [0059], page 6, [0064]-[0065]).

Anand does disclose that a workflow comprises of a plurality of processing steps (page 1, [0004], lines 1-14). However, Anand is silent in explicitly teaching the sequence/order of the processing steps or plurality of tasks to complete the transition. Raventos teaches a transaction based service that defines various tasks or functions that could be used on different types of resources, namely, transactional and non-transactional resources such that the sequence order of tasks in a completed transaction is defined/specified as well as the states of the transaction being monitored (see Abstract, page 2, [0009] and [0021], page 6, [0044], page 8, [0055], last 6 lines of [0057], page 10, [0068]). Anand and Raventos are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor of a transaction/workflow processing system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anand such that it would include the feature of providing a sequence/order for completion of the processing steps or plurality of tasks, as taught in Raventos. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of aiding to fully and properly activate the services of the system (page 1, last four lines of [0004], [0006], lines 1-5, [0001]).

Anand and Raventos are silent in generating a state diagram for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, each one of said plurality of different types of resources being associated with one of said state diagrams; wherein each one of said state diagrams describing valid transitions for said plurality of provisioning states defined for each one of said plurality of different types of resources. However, Fish teaches a state diagram being generated for each one of different types of resources, each one of said plurality of different types of resources being associated with one of said state diagrams, wherein each one of said state diagrams describing valid transitions for said plurality of provisioning states defined for each one of said plurality of different types of resources (See Fig. 4 and Fig. 5A, col. 7, lines 1-23 and 30-53). Fish as well as Anand in view of Raventos are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of an administrating communication system based on state machines. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Anand in view of Raventos to include the feature of generating a state diagram for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, each one of said plurality of different types of resources being associated with one of said state diagrams; wherein each one of said state diagrams describing valid transitions for said plurality of provisioning states defined for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, as taught in Fish. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of a precise and consistent as well as unified system for administrating the communication network (see Fish, col. 1, lines 40-47 and col. 2, lines 49-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Anand, Raventos, and Fish to obtain the invention of claim 1.

Final Office Action dated February 26, 2009, pages 3-5.

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). In determining obviousness, the scope and content of the prior art are... determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are... ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background, the obviousness or non-obviousness of the subject matter is determined. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007). Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *Id.* (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006)).

Amended claim 1 recites:

> 1. A method for managing the provisioning of a plurality of different types of resources in a data processing system, said method comprising:
>
> defining a plurality of provisioning states for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, wherein each one of said plurality of different types of resources is associated with at least one of a capability specification and an implementation specification, and wherein said plurality of different types of resources are grouped according to the specification;
>
> defining relationships among said plurality of provisioning states, said relationships describing valid transitions from ones of said plurality of provisioning states to other ones of said plurality of provisioning states;
>
> generating a state diagram for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, each one of said plurality of different types of resources being associated with one of said state diagrams, wherein each one of said state diagrams describing valid transitions for said plurality of provisioning states defined for each one of said plurality of different types of resources; and
>
> defining at least one task that is associated with each one of said valid transitions, wherein defining at least one task that is associated with each one of said valid transitions comprises:
>
> specifying a plurality of tasks for each one of said valid transitions;
>
> specifying a sequence for completion for said plurality of tasks for each one of said valid transitions, said plurality of tasks being required to be

completed in said sequence in order to complete each one of said valid transitions; and

providing said plurality of tasks in said sequence as a module that will complete one of said valid transitions when said module is executed; and

utilizing said module to complete said one of said valid transitions for each one of said plurality of different types of resources, wherein the same module is used regardless of which resource type is being transitioned.

Amended claim 1 is a method for managing the provisioning of a plurality of different types of resources in a data processing system. The method comprises defining a plurality of provisioning states for each one of the plurality of different types of resources. Each one of the plurality of different types of resources is associated with a specification selected from a group consisting of a capability and an implementation. Also, the method comprises defining relationships among the plurality of provisioning states, the relationships describing valid transitions from ones of the plurality of provisioning states to other ones of the plurality of provisioning states. A state diagram is generated for each one of the plurality of different types of resources. Each one of the plurality of different types of resources is associated with one of the state diagrams. Also, each one of the state diagrams describes valid transitions for the plurality of provisioning states defined for each one of the plurality of different types of resources. The method also comprises defining at least one task that is associated with each one of the valid transitions, wherein defining at least one task that is associated with each one of the valid transitions further comprises: specifying a plurality of tasks for each one of said valid transitions; specifying a sequence for completion for the plurality of tasks for each one of the valid transitions, the plurality of tasks being required to be completed in the sequence in order to complete each one of the valid transitions; and providing the plurality of tasks in the sequence as a module that will complete one of the valid transitions when the module is executed. Also, the method utilizes the module to complete one of the valid transitions for each one of the plurality of different types of resources, wherein the same module is used regardless of which resource type is being transitioned.

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 cannot be asserted against amended claim 1 over *Anand* in view of *Raventos* and *Fish* because the proposed combination of references, considered as a whole, do not teach or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1, in the overall combination of amended claim 1. For example, *Anand* in view of *Raventos* and *Fish* does not teach or suggest the feature of amended claim 1 of, "wherein each one of said plurality of

different types of resources is associated with at least one of a capability specification and an implementation specification, and wherein said plurality of different types of resources are grouped according to the specification." In the Final Office Action dated February 26, 2009, the Examiner asserts that paragraph [0008] of *Anand* teaches that a plurality of provisioning states are defined for each one of said plurality of different types of resources. Paragraph [0008] of *Anand* recites the following:

> [0008] In typical commerce systems, state information and enforcement of action validity are embedded within the implementation of each of the business processes. Making changes to the business processes is a time consuming endeavor which must be undertaken by system implementers. By modeling and executing business processes as state machines, these processes can be modified without making any changes to the underlying computer programs that are implementations of the business processes. A commerce function is reconfigured simply by reconfiguring its corresponding state machine. In addition to the functionality of traditional state machines, the present invention adds three key features: the concept of roles, the coordination of interactions of multiple parties, and the ability to allow different organizations to use different versions of the business process.

This portion of *Anand* teaches state information and enforcement of action validity are embedded within the implementation of each of the business processes. Changing business processes is a time consuming endeavor. Modeling business processes as state machines allows changes without changing the underlying computer program. However, *Anand* is completely devoid of grouping a plurality of different types of resources according to a capability specification or an implementation specification. *Anand* merely teaches that state information is embedded within the implementation of each business process. Even assuming, in *arguendo*, that a business process is the same as a resource, *Anand* never groups the business processes based on a specification. Furthermore, *Anand* teaches away from claim 1 by teaching using state information for the implementation of each business process and not for the groups of each type of a plurality of different resources.

Additionally, *Raventos* does not teach or suggest this feature. *Raventos* teaches a system and method for enabling performance of a transaction-based service utilizing non-transactional resources. *Raventos*, Abstract. The system includes one component that defines tasks executable by at least one of such non-transactional resources. *Id.*

However, *Raventos* never teaches or suggests that each one of said plurality of different types of resources is associated with at least one of a capability specification and an implementation specification, and wherein said plurality of different types of resources are grouped according to the specification.

Additionally, *Fish* does not teach or suggest this feature. *Fish* teaches a communications system which includes a switch having communication resources such as cards containing multiple devices, each having multiple ports. *Fish*, Abstract. The switch contains an administrative agent that maintains hierarchical state information for each resource within the switch. *Id.* However, *Fish* never teaches or suggests that each one of said plurality of different types of resources is associated with at least one of a capability specification and an implementation specification, and wherein said plurality of different types of resources are grouped according to the specification.

As shown above, none of the cited references teaches or suggests this claimed feature. Furthermore, the proposed combination of references, considered as a whole, does not teach or suggest claim 1, in the overall combination of claim 1. Therefore, the Examiner cannot state a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 1. Additionally claims 11 and 20 contain similar features and cannot be obvious as well. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

II. Objection to Claims

The examiner has objected to claims 11 and 20 for the following reason:

> Both claims 11 and 20 can be interpreted to one of ordinary skill in the art as software, per se. The "means" of claim 11 and "instructions" of claim 20 should be stored and executed, respectively, by a processor. Appropriate correction is required.

Final Office Action dated February 26, 2009, page 2.

The claims have been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, this objection has been overcome.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 21, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Neil G. Ferrari/

Neil G. Ferrari
Reg. No. 61,484
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants